

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/168,702	08/13/98	CLEVER	E 5012-2

NORMAN E LEHRER  
1205 NORTH KINGS HIGHWAY  
CHERRY HILL NJ 08034

QH21/0413

EXAMINER
CARLSON, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3712	

**DATE MAILED:** 04/13/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/188,702</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Clever et al</b>
	Examiner <b>Jeffrey D. Carlson</b>	Group Art Unit <b>3712</b>

Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

#### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claims 1-3 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

***Election/Restriction***

1. Claims 1 and 2 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising female connectors having two holes to accept a two fingered connector. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

There are four different types of pieces disclosed: a) the rods of figure 1, b) the hubs of figures 1-3, c) the hub of figure 5 and d) the block of figure 4. Claim 3 is believed to read only on d). It is unclear to the examiner which, if any, of b) through d) read on claims 1 and/or 2. If applicant argues that d) reads on claims 1-3, the examiner is willing to search and examine that single species alone if applicant desires. If applicant desires to pursue one of a) through c), then the claims that read upon that single species will be further restricted from claim 3. As drafted, the examiner will not examine the block of figure 4 along with another piece of a) through c).

2. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

3. A telephone call was made to Norman Lehrer on 4/8/99 to request an oral election to the

above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson, whose telephone number is listed below. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 to 6:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday's.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

  
Jeffrey D. Carlson  
April 8, 1999  
Fax: (703)308-3402

  
Robert A. Hafer  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700